

from 14 and 24 months, far shorter than depreciation rules. This skewed limitation places manufacturers at a competitive disadvantage.

In a slowing economy, more flexibility is needed over capital investment choices. Many manufacturers would like to expand their businesses and increase employment opportunities. They would have greater opportunities to do so if the tax code recognized a more realistic economic life expectation for this equipment. Unfortunately, these business owners often put off investing in new equipment due to the unfavorable tax treatment they receive from the outdated computer depreciation schedule.

Specifically, the legislation we are introducing would update the tax code to acknowledge the rapid advancements in computer technology by changing the depreciation period for computer equipment used in manufacturing processes from five years to two years. We need to encourage businesses to make investments that will keep them competitive, not penalize them with an outdated tax provision.

Please join us in this effort to inject a little common sense into the Internal Revenue Code by cosponsoring the Computer Equipment Common Sense Depreciation Act.

CHILD PROTECTION/ALCOHOL AND DRUG PARTNERSHIP ACT

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2001

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I reintroducing legislation today to improve the prevention, screening, and treatment of substance abuse for parents with children in the child welfare system. Regrettably, child welfare workers and judges are not always sufficiently trained in how to detect and cope with substance abuse problems. And of even greater concern, when accurate assessments are made, there is often a lack of available treatment. In fact, the Department of Health and Human Services reports that 63 percent of all mothers with drug problems do not receive any substance abuse treatment within a year.

To combat this threat to child safety and family stability, I am introducing the Child Protection/Alcohol and Drug Partnership Act, which would provide \$1.9 billion over the next five years to States that develop cooperative arrangements between their substance abuse and child abuse agencies to provide services to the parents of at-risk children. Bipartisan companion legislation has been introduced by Senators SNOWE and ROCKEFELLER.

Under the bill, funding would be disbursed to States based on the number of children in the State. To receive their allotment under the program, States would be required to spend a match starting at 15 percent in 2002, rising to 25 percent in 2006. In addition, they would be required to provide a detailed analysis of their current efforts to address substance abuse issues for families in the child welfare system and specify the additional steps they intend to pursue with the new funding (supplanting of existing funds would be prohibited). Funding could be used for a variety of specific activities, including: providing preventive and early intervention services for children of parents with alcohol and drug problems; expanding the

availability of substance abuse treatment, including residential treatment, for parents involved with the child welfare system; and improving the screening and assessment of substance abuse problems for families in the child welfare system.

I urge my colleagues to join me in sponsoring this proposal, which is strongly supported by the Children's Defense Fund, the Child Welfare League of America, the National Association of State Alcohol and Drug Abuse Directors, and the American Public Human Services Association.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H. CON. RES. 83, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002

SPEECH OF

HON. DENNIS MOORE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2001

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the conference report on H. Con. Res. 83, the Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2002.

This conference agreement was developed in a manner which abused the congressional budget process. Consider the following:

The debate in the House on the tax cut contained in this budget resolution has already taken place. We were forced to vote on these cuts—which far exceed the levels contained in this conference agreement—months before we will understand the full impact of what we were considering.

The House was later forced to consider its version of the budget resolution prior to receiving the President's budget.

The Senate Budget Committee was never afforded the opportunity to consider this bill; rather the committee of jurisdiction was circumvented using a questionable procedure.

Minority House and Senate Members were explicitly noticed that they would not be included in negotiations between the two chambers to work out differences between the competing versions of the budget.

Finally, in the most recent example of an abuse of power, the House leadership filed late last week a resolution only moments before it was to be adopted in the dead-of-the night, without a Congressional Budget Office analysis or a Joint Tax Committee scoring of the tax cut.

Mr. Speaker, in its haste to rush through a conference report before anyone had a chance to look at the details, two pages were lost that happened to contain language crucial to the compromise that persuaded moderates to agree to this budget. As a result, members, including the minority, were afforded the opportunity to examine this budget in detail over four days. This fortuitous event afforded me the opportunity to discover that the numbers in this budget simply do not add up and that there is much more missing than two pages.

Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement calls for \$661.3 billion in discretionary spending for fiscal year 2002. Instead of making recommendations for the level of funding for our national priorities, however, the conference agreement lists CBO baseline levels, and then uses a plug number of \$6 billion in a catchall

function known as "allowances" to make the numbers for 2002 add up.

These unrealistic discretionary spending levels will result in a year-end conflict over funding levels for appropriations bills, much like those we have seen in years past. Undoubtedly, we will soon be faced with a chaotic budget process that drags on into the fall that produces much higher spending than would have been necessary had we reached agreement on realistic spending levels within the context of the budget resolution.

Moreover, if one takes these spending numbers at face value, then this majority has broken its promise to increase funding for education and the critical research needs at the National Institutes of Health (NIH). The majority will argue that the function numbers in the conference agreement do not represent intended policy and that increases for education and NIH can be provided by the Appropriations Committee.

But if appropriators can change the recommended levels, what purpose does this budget resolution serve? The troubling conclusion is that either these increases will come at the expense of other programs or we will once again far exceed the spending targets outlined in this resolution.

More troubling than the unrealistic spending levels are the items missing from this budget. Last week, the President established a Commission on Social Security reform and announced his commitment to pursuing a national missile defense system. Nobody knows how much either of these broad initiatives will cost and the budget fails to account for either of these items.

Also conspicuously missing from this conference report are funds for debt reduction. This budget commits funds dedicated to the Medicare and Social Security Trust Funds to debt reduction without devoting a single dollar of our projected on-budget surpluses towards paying down our national debt. This is like a family using one credit card to pay off another and then claiming that their debt was paid. The American people will not be deceived by this manipulation.

Finally, there is one more missing page that explains how all of our other priorities, including education, emergencies, defense increases and future tax cuts, will fit into the so-called contingency fund. Indeed, the overall tax and spending totals in this budget will virtually eliminate the non-Social Security, non-Medicare budget surplus. Any additional expenditures as expected in defense; any downward revisions of the surplus projections that may occur due to our slowing economy, increased unemployment, decreased labor productivity, and lower-than expected revenue collections; or, any additional tax cuts above and beyond those contained in this so-called agreement—and I have reason to believe that these will occur since the Secretary of the Treasury testified last week that he would be willing to consider tax breaks that go beyond the budget resolution on a case-by-case basis—will return this nation back to the era of deficits, tapping our Social Security and Medicare Trust Funds.

Mr. Speaker, on May 1, 2001, I sent the Chairman of the Budget Committee a letter indicating I could support the proposed budget resolution provided that the resolution cut taxes no more than \$1.25 trillion, set realistic spending levels, and maintained a commitment to debt reduction by ensuring that any

remaining on-budget surpluses be devoted to debt reduction. These conditions were not only not met, but there was not even an opportunity to discuss them.

Because of these concerns about process, unrealistic spending levels, the failure to reduce our national debt and the very real threat this budget poses to our Social Security and Medicare Trust Funds, I will vote against this resolution and urge my colleagues to do the same.

ELECTION REFORM

HON. MARTIN FROST

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2001

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS and the Members of the Democratic Caucus Special Committee on Election Reform for their hard work in organizing election reform hearings across America, and developing Democratic proposals on election reform.

Ensuring every American's vote is counted is the cornerstone to rebuilding faith in our democracy. That's why Democrats have made clear our commitment to finding bipartisan solutions to the ills that plague America's electoral process. Real election reform is a top priority for the American people and is the civil rights issue of the new millennium.

Unfortunately, I know the Election Reform Committee has heard a great deal about attempts to intimidate minority voters around the country during this past election. Having attended two of the Special Committee's field hearings, I know how important they are to uncovering the truth about voter suppression, and to ensuring we stop efforts to disenfranchise African American and Hispanic voters in the future.

It is clear that what happened in Florida to intimidate and suppress African American turnout was not an isolated incident. In fact, significant efforts to suppress the African American vote occurred in my district in Fort Worth this fall. I personally witnessed a systematic campaign by local Republicans to harass, intimidate and suppress African American voters—especially senior citizens.

With so many sad examples of voter intimidation and voting irregularities, the need for real action on election reform could not be clearer. After the field hearings are completed, Democrats will propose to the House real steps to make it easier for people to vote, expand participation in our democracy, and fix a broken system that has disenfranchised too many Americans for too long.

The importance of election reform to preserving the integrity of our democracy is so great that we must not allow partisan politics to keep Congress from addressing it. I thank Congressman WATERS for her strong leadership and for organizing this special order, and I desperately hope Republicans will join us in passing meaningful election reform to ensure every American's vote is counted.

TRIBUTE TO BERNIE ROBINSON

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2001

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Bernie Robinson who has served the State of Illinois and indeed all of us as the Assistant to the Governor of Illinois in charge of the state's Washington, DC office.

Bernie is about to leave his position for some exciting opportunities in the private sector. It would be inappropriate of me not to take this opportunity to publicly thank him for the work he has done, the counsel he has given and the lifetime's worth of friendships that he has made within our delegation.

Thanks to Bernie and his capable staff, the State of Illinois has emerged with the most cohesive voice that we have ever had in terms of pursuing opportunities for the people we serve. It would be impossible for me to list all of Bernie's accomplishments, but I cannot overstate the important role he played in helping to bring our delegation together in pursuit of appropriations projects and priorities for our state. Thanks to him, I have a better understanding of the special needs of my colleagues in the northern part of Illinois and they have a better understanding of mine.

Only one person could have brought together a delegation as diverse as the one we currently have. Without Bernie, it's unlikely that we would have had the successes that we have.

I know that the members and staff of the Illinois delegation join me in thanking Bernie and wishing him well in his new endeavors.

Bernie Robinson is a unique individual who has enriched our lives and allowed us to better understand who we are and how we can work together.

Thanks also to Bernie's children, Sarah and Army, who have allowed us to share so much of Bernie's time. Together with his beloved wife Bess, may God rest her soul, Bernie has proven that the greatest joy in our lives is the beauty and potential of our children. He has prepared them for a life of tremendous possibilities and all indications are that they are poised to tackle them.

Bernie, our thanks for establishing a foundation from which our delegation and therefore our state will grow and prosper. God's blessings to you and yours.

KEEP D.C. GENERAL HOSPITAL OPEN

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2001

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, we, as a nation, spend more on health care than any other country in the world. Yet, we have 43 million uninsured people and our working families continue to struggle to obtain quality and affordable care. And now, in our nation's capitol, there are efforts to close down the last remaining public hospital in the city, D.C. General. The closure of public hospitals around our nation and D.C. General, in particular, should be of concern to us all.

In Michigan, our public hospitals continue to serve patients and communities with dignity and with the belief that all people have the right to health care. These public hospitals provide our uninsured and underinsured working men and women with the quality and essential health care they deserve. D.C. General has been serving the people of Washington, D.C. since 1806, and the care it provides is crucial for residents of the nation's capitol.

I am deeply concerned with the impact the closure of this hospital will have on the residents of Washington, D.C. In Detroit and other urban and rural communities, affordable and reliable health care is becoming hard to find. Our public hospitals serve local communities without prejudice and are the only source of care millions in this nation can rely on. Now, the people of Washington, D.C. will have no choice but to turn to private hospitals for their health care—hospitals that base their care on a person's financial status and ability to pay.

Those who advocate closing D.C. General are concerned that the hospital has woefully inadequate funds to operate. The financial situation of this and other public hospitals is severely impacted by Congress' unwillingness to provide additional resources and the fact our public hospitals serve most of our uninsured and poor. The plight of D.C. General is just one example of what will happen if we do not stand up immediately and support our public hospitals.

I am also deeply troubled by the process that determined the fate of D.C. General Hospital. Through the use of an unelected financial control board, those wishing to see the hospital closed overrode the democratically-elected D.C. City Council, who unanimously opposed the closure of the hospital. In 1999, a similar situation occurred in Detroit, when Lansing lawmakers dissolved the elected city school board and appointed a supervisory board, unaccountable to the citizens of Detroit. The Detroit school takeover and the D.C. control board's actions should be of concern to all Americans. Both these actions denied citizens a voice in the decisions affecting their lives. Our compassion and resolve to ensure quality health care and education for all must not be compromised by an unelected body which is accountable to no one.

Today, I join many of my colleagues in Congress, community leaders in my home state and from around our great nation, and champions in the Michigan State Legislature in urging that D.C. General be kept open and accessible to the people of Washington, D.C.

A TRIBUTE TO RABBI HILLEL COHN FOR 38 YEARS OF SERVICE TO CALIFORNIA'S INLAND EMPIRE

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2001

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like today to pay tribute to my good friend Rabbi Hillel Cohn, who for the past 38 years has been a remarkable community leader, and a spiritual guiding force for thousands of members of Congregation Emanu El in San Bernardino County, California. After nearly four decades as leader of this congregation, Rabbi Cohn is retiring this week.